

vices as tax rebates. Needless to say, the U.S. producer does not expect such favored treatment, but we do believe that we should be given protection against others who do receive it. The tables of the written statement show effect of such policies, in conjunction with the ability to practice dumping, and the comparison between home market prices and export prices is striking.

Furthermore, the importation of foreign steel causes a net loss in tax revenue accruing to our governmental authorities. Our brief shows that over \$5 million in taxes were lost in 1962 as a result of the 150,000 tons of plate which foreign producers shipped into the United States. Thus, the net loss in tax revenue for each ton of imported steel plate amount to \$33.

Over the past 2 years, Japan, Mexico, and the E.C.S.C. have together accounted for more than three-fourths of the steel plate imported into the United States. It is interesting to note that the country with the highest tariff, Japan, is also the one that in the past few years has shipped the largest amount of plate into the United States. The second largest importer to the United States is Mexico, a country which has not been referred to extensively by others. You will note on page 24 of our statement that Mexico in the last 5 years has increased its export of plates to the United States from nothing to over 50,000 tons in the first 10 months of 1963, whereas our exports have decreased from 2,000 tons to about 600 tons over the same period of time. The Mexican imports represent about 10 percent of the steel plate market in the southwest area of our country. Mexico is now the fastest growing participant in the U.S. plate market.

Mexico and Japan have been the two largest recipients of U.S. financial assistance in their steel industry, eight Japanese steel companies have received \$276 million and nine Mexican companies over \$90 million. The U.S. producer with private capital is now ironically faced with serious injury as a result of the predatory practices of those foreign producers financed out of the U.S. producers' taxes.

A look at the written statement will show that Mexico sells steel to the United States at a base price of more than \$31 a ton lower than the price in Mexico. At the same time, however, this problem of cost of entry, referred to above in connection with other foreign countries, does not even apply to Mexico. There is no cost of entry into Mexico because there is no entry except by license, and this is given only if the steel cannot be produced in Mexico. In effect, imports are prohibited.

I have tried briefly to sketch the serious consequences for the U.S. steelplate industry which will result if the present foreign practices are not prohibited or equalized. I have tried to point out what these practices are and how they unfairly penalize the U.S. steelplate producer. On behalf of Lukens and other U.S. steelplate producers, I should now like to urge your earnest consideration that:

1. U.S. steel tariffs be placed on the reserve list.
2. Effective action be taken to prevent dumping of steelplates in the United States.
3. The cost of entry of steelplates into the United States and other countries be equalized.
4. Failing the above, U.S. tariffs on plates be adjusted upward to accomplish a comparable result.

5. If tariffs cannot be adjusted sufficiently to be effective, a system of plate quotas be adopted as a temporary measure until the U.S. producer is granted the opportunity to compete on an equal footing with the foreign producer.

Gentlemen, we believe that your aggressive and successful efforts for such remedial action will go far to remove existing

inequitable conditions and enable U.S. steelplate producers to compete with producers in other nations whose economy has not as yet reached our standards, whose governments subsidize their industries, whose depreciation rates are designed to attract capital, and whose corporations are allowed to enter into international monopolies.

Thank you for your attention.

FLORIDA EAST COAST RAILWAY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I hope the issue raised yesterday by the Senator from Oregon when he introduced S. 2561 receives early attention by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. It seems an urgent and important matter.

As my friend from Oregon remarked last evening, the Florida Du Pont estate appears to be an extraordinary combination of banks, industries, railroads and real estate. The Miami Herald of last Sunday described this Du Pont estate as "Florida's most powerful economic-political force," valued at well over a billion dollars—and all in the hands of one man.

One would expect combinations of this sort to be subject to our antitrust laws. As my colleagues know, I have a particular interest in the antitrust field. It is an area of great concern to me.

It surprises one that this great Du Pont estate, with its 31 banks, was exempted from the Bank Holding Company Act. As the Senator said, that act is essentially an antitrust measure, designed to prevent unfair competitive practices and the growth of monopolistic tendencies in the banking industry.

Certainly the Du Pont estate's exemption from the Bank Holding Company Act—based on the record put before us by the Senator from Oregon—deserves early attention. I hope the committee will be able to consider this bill at an early date.

VICIOUS ANTI-SEMITISM OF THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the New York Times for February 27 contained a shocking report that an official agency of the Soviet Government was publishing a vicious and slanderous tract attacking members of the Jewish faith.

A book entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment" is being distributed under the imprint of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. It is an absolute perversion and distortion of fact under the guise of "science." The Jews were viciously persecuted under the czars. It is a tragic fact of history that the present totalitarian regime in Russia has inherited and continued the anti-Semitic policies of its predecessor. The shocking fact is that this book is not the work of some demented crackpot, but an official effort of an alleged academy of science. The crudest lie in this tract is the charge that Zionist leaders aided the Nazis. This is brazen and outrageous rewriting of history.

Religion is and will be the greatest threat to totalitarian rule. The strength men draw from their faith in God will

always make them strive for freedom. The Russians have worked relentlessly to destroy religious faith. They have not been successful and never will be.

I hope that outraged world opinion will force the Russians, who pass themselves off as the protectors of minorities, to stop continuing the ideology of the Nazis they say they so despise.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the two articles in the Record on the subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOVIET SAID TO DOOM NINE IN BIG FRAUD RING

(By Theodore Shabad)

Moscow, February 26.—Nine persons have been sentenced to death as members of a Moscow fraud ring involving Soviet officials, according to reliable sources.

Four others have been given 15-year jail terms and about 10 others, lesser prison sentences after a 2-month trial of 23 persons, all of whom were found guilty of having participated in a private enterprise ring. Eighteen of the accused are understood to be Jews.

It was not known how many of the nine sentenced to death were Jews and whether they included the ring leader, identified as Shakerman, who received a separate death sentence earlier this month. The only other members of the ring who have been identified in the press are Roifman and Galperin, both Jewish names.

The ring was said to have netted three million rubles (\$8.3 million) by using mental patients to produce knitted goods, which were then sold through illegal retail outlets in the marketplaces and railway stations.

The illegal shops and vast supplies of raw materials were obtained by bribing Soviet officials.

In an appeal to Premier Khrushchev, made public February 17, a group of distinguished Western citizens, including six Nobel Prize winners, expressed concern that about half of those executed in the Soviet Union for economic crimes in the last 3 years were Jews.

Soviet authorities have steadfastly denied that the nationality of the accused in crimes of embezzlement, bribery, theft of state property and so forth had any bearing on the cases.

Last October, Izvestia, the Government newspaper, demanded a major show trial of the Shakerman ring as a deterrent against economic crimes which have shown no indication of declining despite the imposition of the death sentence since 1961.

Izvestia identified some of the Jewish accused by name and added:

"We mention the Jewish surnames * * * because we pay no heed to malicious slander that is being stirred up in the Western press from time to time. It is not Jews, Russians, Tartars or Ukrainians who will stand trial—criminals will stand trial."

TRIAL CLOSED TO PUBLIC

Plans for a show trial were shelved, presumably because of the involvement of bribe-taking Soviet officials. When the trial opened without publicity late December, the public and Western newsmen were not admitted.

Outsiders were understood to have been barred from the courtroom because the bribe-takers were to be identified during testimony.

RAILROAD OFFICIALS INVOLVED

The officials are known to include two former masters of the Kursk railroad station, one of the busiest railroad stations of the Soviet capital.

They were given 7-year prison terms last September for having accepted 1,300 rubles (\$1,443) and other gifts from the Shakerman ring.

The Western expression of concern over Jewish involvement in the economic crimes was contained in the appeal urging better treatment of the Soviet Union's 2½ million Jews. The appeal, dated December 2, was made public by Bertrand Russell, the British philosopher, after no reply had been received from Mr. Khrushchev.

The signers told the Soviet Premier they hoped Soviet Jews would "be permitted full cultural lives, religious freedom, and rights of a national group, in practice as well as in law."

The Nobel Prize winners who joined the appeal were Dr. Max Born of West Germany, Francois Mauriac of France, Lord Boyd Orr of Britain, Prof. Linus C. Pauling of the United States, and Dr. Albert Schweitzer.

KEATING DISTURBED

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING said today that he was disturbed by State Department reluctance to blame the Russian Government for anti-Semitism within the Soviet Union.

"The fact that official Soviet spokesman consistently deny the existence of any anti-Semitic bias in Soviet policy is no reason for the citizens of the United States to accept without protest this continuing Soviet prejudice and injustice," the New York Republican said on the floor.

He made public a report from the State Department, prepared at his request, on anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. In it the Department concluded that official protests would not be "in the best interests of Soviet Jews."

"There is no evidence," the report stated, "that the authorities intend to incite the public to acts of anti-Jewish violence. Rather, they seem to be using popular anti-Semitic sentiments for their own purpose."

SOVIET BOOK ATTACKS JEWS

(By Irving Spleigel)

The American Jewish Committee reported yesterday that an official body of the Soviet Government had published a book utilizing Nazi-like caricatures to attack Jews and Judaism. The committee displayed a copy of the book.

Details of the 190-page volume, in the Ukrainian language and entitled "Judaism Without Embellishment," were outlined by Morris B. Abram, president of the committee, at a news conference at the organization's headquarters at the Institute of Human Relations, 165 East 56th Street.

The book bears the imprint of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences. The author is M. K. Kichko, described as a professor of philosophy. The book was printed in Kiev in 1963.

Mr. Abram, a U.S. member of the United Nations Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, denounced the book as a "hodgepodge of misinformation, distortion, malicious gossip, and insulting references to Jews and Judaism."

CARICATURE ON COVER

The book's cover bears a caricature of a Jew clad in a prayer shawl, leading a congregation in prayer and holding money in his hand.

Other captions over caricatures say: "All sorts of swindlers and cheats find refuge in the synagogues," "The swindlers in religious articles sometimes wage battles among themselves over the divisions of the spoils," and "During the years of Hitlerite occupation the Zionist leaders served the Fascists."

Ridicule is leveled in the book against the Talmud, one of the most revered books of Judaism. The Talmud is a compendium of religious and ethical laws that provide a code to daily living and behavior.

Mr. Abram said that about 12,000 copies of the book were in circulation in the Soviet Union.

He added that he would protest the book to Boris S. Ivanov, a Soviet member of the United Nations Subcommission on Minorities.

REPRESENTATIVE RALPH J. RIVERS DISSECTS THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION'S ILL-ADVISED ATTEMPT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a very foolish attempt is being made by the U.S. Civil Service Commission to upset the long-established patterns of the cost-of-living allowance paid to classified Federal employees in the outlying areas of the United States where unique conditions have properly called for appropriate employment practices. The Commission has sponsored legislation which would seek to substitute in-grade promotions for the present well-established generally satisfactory if not wholly adequate system. Naturally the people of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands who would be gravely and adversely affected are up in arms. The economy of these areas would also suffer seriously at a time when the President is waging an all-out war on poverty, and has successfully sponsored tax-cut legislation designed to bolster our economy.

An excellent statement opposing the proposed legislation as far as Alaska is concerned but applicable to the other areas that would be affected if this ill-considered proposed legislation were enacted, was made this morning by Alaska's Representative, the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee subcommittee considering the legislation proposed in H.R. 7401.

I ask unanimous consent that Representative RIVERS' remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM ALASKA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, IN OPPOSITION TO H.R. 7401, ON FEBRUARY 27, 1964

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to be heard in opposition to H.R. 7401, which would terminate the cost-of-living allowance paid to classified Federal employees in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, and amend the so-called Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962 in such a way as to stretch the pay system set forth in that act to make it fit the unusual situation in Alaska, and the situations in the referenced offshore areas.

Before criticizing this bill, I wish to make it clear that it is my impression that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service introduced it upon request (although such words were not included on the face of the bill), and that in doing so he lent his name to a bill drafted by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, sponsored by the Civil Service Commission, and promoted by the Civil Service Commission. I base this statement upon the executive request addressed to Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives, under date of May 14 and signed by John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of said Commission.

Involved in H.R. 7401 is a fundamental dispute. In pressing for the legislation, the Civil Service Commission contends that it is acting under a mandate from the Congress

contained in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962. I have read this act with care, recognize its applicability to the 48 contiguous States, note that section 502 sets up a criterion of comparability with private enterprise salary rates for the same levels of work upon the basis of national averages, but I fail to find any mandate telling the Civil Service Commission to seek legislation to abolish the cost-of-living allowance in areas where the rates of pay found by determining nationwide averages are inadequate, and, therefore, invalid.

This is highlighted by the fact that upward adjustments authorized in section 504 of the Salary Reform Act of 1962 are limited to the seventh salary rate prescribed by law for classification grades or levels, which fits the economic situation and salary requirements of the older 48 States but is inadequate to encompass the economic situation and Federal salary requirements in Alaska. This is consistent with the fact that a 25-percent cost-of-living allowance has been in effect in Alaska for many years, and ostensibly when the Congress enacted the 1962 act, it intended to keep the cost-of-living allowance in Alaska and the other cost-of-living allowance areas.

This point becomes clearer when you look at the rates of starting pay and maximums within grades up to and including the seventh level presently in effect. The rate at the seventh level is not high enough to encompass present base rates in Alaska plus 25 percent as the equivalent of the cost-of-living allowance, even without considering the increased tax factor. This is tacitly admitted in H.R. 7401, on page 2, section 3(1), lines 19 to 22, which read as follows:

"Provided, That in no case, except in Alaska, shall any minimum salary rate so established exceed the seventh salary rate prescribed by law for the grade or level."

Additionally, you will find in section 4 of the bill, lines 6 through 13, on page 3, that admittedly the maximum salary of \$20,000 set by the Salary Reform Act of 1962 is considered inadequate for several top grades in Alaska.

This demonstrates to me that in passing the 1962 act, the Congress intended that the base rates to be established thereunder would apply to Alaska without changing the cost-of-living allowance.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, let us now look into the original reason for establishing the cost-of-living allowance in 1949 and the part it has played in the maintenance of a good civil service establishment in Alaska.

Postal employees and other Federal civil servants in Alaska couldn't make ends meet on the regular base pay rates in effect in the 48 States. The cost of living in Alaska, which was as high as 50 percent over the national average, impelled the establishment of a cost-of-living allowance. Such allowance, also found to be warranted in other non-contiguous areas of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, was, therefore, established by section 207 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1949 with a maximum of 25 percent above the regular base rates. This allowance did not entirely cover the excessive difference between the cost of living in Alaska and the 48 contiguous States, but was a great palliative in removing hardship and in solving the Federal Government's recruitment problem. This 25-percent cost-of-living allowance, combined with exempting same from the Federal income tax, established an equitable situation in Alaska. Permit me to say that in the ensuing years the situation hasn't changed. The latest Bureau of Labor statistics report on the cost of living—using Washington, D.C., as the base—shows as follows: Anchorage, 143.2; Fairbanks, 146.5; Juneau, 132.8. Included in establishing those figures are the following items: market basket, clothing, housing, transportation, recrea-